

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
(Plaintiff)

v.

RE: CHALONER SAINTILLUS
(Defendant)

Morish Haitian-American Nation

IN RE: Shalam C. Saintillus-Bey;

Case # 2:20-cr-00213 KJM
NOTICE OF APPEAL

FILED

JUN 16 2022

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY DEPUTY CLERK

COMES NOW the Defendant, Shalam C. Saintillus-Bey, In Propria Persona, SUI JURIS, and hereby gives notice of appeal from the Several Denials Imposed (from Motion to dismiss ECF NO. 8) Docket numbers 122, 123, and 124 on June 1, 2022 by this Court.

Respectfully submitted June 11, 2022.

: Shalam C. Saintillus-Bey;

: Shalam C. Saintillus-Bey;

In Pro Per. / Pro Se.

Copy Mailed this 11th day of June, 2022.

TO Each of the Following:

DISTRICT Attorney OFFICE ; OFFice of the clerk of Court

501 I Street, Ste; 10-100

501 I Street, Ste; 4-200

Sac, California, [95814]

Sac, California, [95814]

Judicial Notice

6/12/22

Per. Fed R. Evid. 201

Case # 2:20-cr-00213-KJM

* 11th Amendment (Congress removed all judicial power from the "Inferior courts" i.e. District courts of the United States.)

* Means the District Attorney does not have Standing to represent "the United States"; Because...

* THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT is a Federal Foreign Corporation.
(28 U.S.C. 3002 Sec. 15(a))

* 1871 The United States lost its Sovereignty reverting back to its Pre Colonial Corporate Status.

* Also SEE: Point 2 of Ground III of Docket # 119-121 "My reply to Gov's opposition".
* FRCP Rule 4(j); 28 U.S.C. Chpt. 97 Sec. 1602-1611 "The United States district court is a Foreign State Court. 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1391

* Point 9 ID. (Supreme Court cases) "There have been no judges since 1789".

* Dred-Scott v. Sanford "Blacks/Negroes are not U.S. Citizens" (SCOTUS)

* Bond v. US (SCOTUS) "Enforcing government Rule is 'illegal'".

* There is NO any jurisdiction/venue/No code, Rules, Regulations, Laws, Congressional acts etc... That Authorizes the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT/US. DISTRICT COURT. It is in fact an Improper venue.

* I am the Beneficiary of the Court bond/Trust property. Subject to the lien attached etc...

The UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT (along with these current "State" courts) are Fraudulent in nature.

* There's No Federal Statute that shows neither of them EXIST, or has any jurisdiction or venue!

* This court an (All) UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS misuses the jurisdiction given to the "District Court of the United States" Pre 1871 (Lost of Sovereignty Status)

* All so called crimes Post 1871 are all Commercial crimes, this Court cannot show me any U.S.C etc in its proper context that show it has Criminal let alone Civil action jurisdiction.

Black's law 5th Pocket E.D. Pg. 440

* Consent jurisdiction (1855) "Jurisdiction that parties have agreed to, either by accord, by contract, or by general appearance. • Parties may not, by agreement, confer subject-matter jurisdiction on a Federal Court that would not otherwise have it."

* Everything this court does is Fraudulent in nature to the fullest sense. I DO NOT Consent, whether by assume (Implied) by general appearance, contract, or accord. Jurisdiction has been challenged, and still not yet proven on Record, Nothing can proceed but a dismissal with prejudice. All Rights Reserved under vcc 1-308. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P 41(b).

* "A court cannot confer jurisdiction where none existed and cannot make a void proceeding valid." Old Wayne Mut L. Assoc. v. McDonough, 204 U.S. 8, 27 S.Ct. 236 (1907)

By: Shaleum C. Santillan-Bey.
In Pro Per./Pro Se.

6/11/22

Proof of Service

Case: 2:20-cr-00213-KJM

The following Documents has been mailed to the following Parties.

- District Attorney Office
MR. STEFENKI ; PHILIP A. TALBERT
501 I Street, Ste: 10-100
Sac, California, [95814]
- Office of the Clerk of Court
501 I Street, Ste: 4-200
Sac, California, [95814]

Per. 28 U.S.C. § 1746 "foregoing is True and Correct."

: Shalun C. Saitillo - Rey:
In Pro Per. / Pro Se.

* Would You please include My One Free Copy of the Current transcript. And Also an Original Filed Free copy of Docket numbers 119, 120, 121. (IF I have only one choice please give me a copy of the latter, Specific Docket numbers requested above, I'm not sure which one it is exactly but it should be titled "My Reply to United States Opposition to Defendants Further Motion To Dismiss"
Thank-You! ** (Special Request)